

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

By this amendment, claims 1, 6, 17, and 18 have been amended, and new claim 19 has been added. Thus, Claims 1-15, and 17-19 are pending.

Support for the amendments can be found at least in paragraphs [0087], [0123]-[0127], [0153]-[0158], Fig. 5(a), Fig. 5(b). The paragraph numbers indicate the paragraphs in the pre-grant publication of the present application, i.e., US 2006/0047624.

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 15 have been rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell (U.S. 6,160,877) in view of Hannel (US 2008/0028436). These rejections are traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a communication system including a first communication terminal and a second communication terminal, each of which having a changeable address, and a communication control server that notifies destination information of the first communication terminal by transmitting a request message. As recited in claim 1, the communication control server determines whether or not the second communication terminal is a connection-permitted communication terminal of the first communication terminal. Claim 1 further recites a notification control unit operable to notify the second communication terminal of the current address as the destination information of the first communication terminal, only when the second communication terminal has been determined to be a connection-permitted communication terminal of the first communication terminal. Claim 1 also recites that the second communication terminal receives the destination information from the communication control server if the second communication terminal is permitted to connect to the first communication terminal, and then connects, independently of the communication control server, to the current address shown by the received destination information. Thus, according to the system recited in claim 1, the second communication terminal can independently connect to the address shown by the destination information without involving the communication control server.

Because of the features recited in claim 1 as discussed above, the following effects can be obtained.

a. It is not necessary for a user of a communication terminal to determine whether or not other communication terminals are connection-permitted communication terminals. Therefore, the user can exclude connection from a communication terminal of an un-permitted user.

b. Under a circumstance where an address shown by destination information of a communication terminal changes, a problem does not occur in communication with a communication terminal of a user by notifying a connection-permitted terminal of the latest destination information.

c. The communication control server itself is not directly involved in connection processing between communication terminals. This can reduce the processing load on the communication control server.

On the other hand, Tatchell discloses a “subscriber terminal,” which the Examiner equates with the first communication terminal recited in claim 1, a “calling party,” which the Examiner equates to the second communication terminal recited in claim 1, and a “personal agent,” which the Examiner equates to the communication control server recited in claim 1. However, in Tatchell, the personal agent is directly involved in connection processing between the subscriber terminal and the calling party. When the calling party is “known to the subscriber” (corresponding to the connection-permitted communication terminal recited in claim 1) communication between the subscriber terminal and the calling party is performed via the personal agent. Thus, the communication between the subscriber terminal and the calling party is not independently performed without involving the personal agent. Accordingly, it cannot be asserted that Tatchell discloses or suggests a notification control unit operable to notify a second communication terminal of a current address as the destination information of a first communication terminal, only when the second communication terminal has been determined to be a connection-permitted communication terminal of the first communication terminal, and that once the destination information is received by the second communication terminal, the second communication terminal then connects, independently of the communication control server, to the current address shown by the received destination information as recited in claim 1.

Thus, the system of Tatchell can realize the effect (a) mentioned above. However, the system of Tatchell cannot realize the effect (b) of the invention recited in claim 1 as discussed above

because a telephone number of the subscriber terminal in Tatchell is not provided to the calling party (which corresponds to the second communication terminal of claim 1). The system of Tatchell also does not realize the effect (c) of the invention recited in claim 1 because the communication between the subscriber terminal and the calling party is dependently performed via the personal agent (corresponding to the communication control server of claim 1).

As with Tatchell, Hannel discloses “resource 2611,” corresponding to the first communication terminal recited in claim 1, “requesting entity 2603,” corresponding to the second communication terminal recited in claim 1, and “policy enforcer 2609” and “policy server 2627,” each corresponding to the communication control server recited in claim 1. However, in Hannel, access from “requesting entity 2603” to “resource 2611” is dependently performed via “policy enforcer 2609.” Also, “requesting entity 2603” is permitted to access “resource 2611” when “policy server 2617” receives a notification indicating that the access is permitted. Thus, the “policy server 2617” controls the access process.

Accordingly, in Hannel, the access to “resource 2611,” (corresponding to the first communication terminal recited in claim 1), is dependently performed via “policy enforcer 2609.” Therefore, Hannel does not disclose or suggest a notification control unit operable to notify a second communication terminal of a current address as the destination information of a first communication terminal, only when the second communication terminal has been determined to be a connection-permitted communication terminal of the first communication terminal, and that once the destination information is received by the second communication terminal, the second communication terminal then connects, independently of the communication control server, to the current address shown by the received destination information as recited in claim 1.

Because of the lack of disclosure by Tatchell and Hannel of features recited in claim 1 as discussed above, no obvious combination of Tatchell and Hannel would result in the invention recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the inventions recited in claims 1-5 would not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention over Tatchell in view of Hannel under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Similarly to claim 1, Claim 15 recites a notification control unit operable to notify a first communication terminal of the current address of a second communication terminal, only when the

first communication terminal is determined to be a connection-permitted communication terminal that is permitted to connect to the second communication terminal. Thus, for similar reasons as those set forth above with respect to claim 1, no obvious combination of Tatchell and Hannel would result in the invention recited in claim 15, and the invention recited in claims 15 and 19 would not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention over Tatchell in view of Hannel under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11-14, 17, and 18 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell in view of Hannel and Numminen (US 2003/0125024). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Tatchell and Hannel in combination do not disclose or suggest the claimed features of independent claim 1 as discussed in detail above. Claims 2 and 3 depend on claim 1. Numminen does not provide the missing disclosure by Tatchell and Hannel of the features recited in claim 1. Therefore, no obvious combination of Tatchell, Hannel and Numminen would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the inventions recited in claims 2 and 3.

Each of claims 6, 17, and 18 includes recitations directed to receiving, from a communication control server, authentication information of a second communication terminal, which is generated and transmitted by the communication control server, receiving a connection acceptance request from the second communication terminal, the communication terminal that receives the authentication information controlling whether or not a connection of the second communication terminal is permitted using the authentication information. With this recited feature, the effect (c) can be realized. However, as discussed in detail above, the communication is dependent on control by the personal agent of Tatchell or the policy enforcer of Hannel. Moreover, Numminen does not provide the missing disclosure by Tatchell and Hannel of the features recited in claims 6, 17, and 18. Therefore, no obvious combination of Tatchell, Hannel and Numminen would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the inventions recited in claims 6-14, 17, or 18.

Claims 3, 8, and 9 have been rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell in view of Hannel, Numminen and Matsubara (US 2003/0225796). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Tatchell and Hannel in combination do not disclose or suggest the claimed features of

independent claims 1 and 6 as discussed in detail above. Claim 3 depends on claim 1 and claims 8 and 9 depend on claim 6. As discussed above, Numminen does not provide the missing disclosure by Tatchell and Hannel of the features recited in claims 1 and 6. Moreover, Matsubara also does not provide the missing disclosure by Tatchell, Hannel and Numminen of the features recited in claims 1 and 6, nor was Matsubara relied on by the Examiner as providing such disclosure. Therefore, no obvious combination of Tatchell, Hannel, Numminen, and Matsubara would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the inventions recited in claims 3, 8, and 9.

Claim 10 has been rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell in view of Hannel, Numminen and Ando (US 2006/0047624). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Tatchell and Hannel in combination do not disclose or suggest the claimed features of independent claim 6 as discussed in detail above. Claim 10 ultimately depends on claim 6. As discussed above, Numminen does not provide the missing disclosure by Tatchell and Hannel of the features recited in claim 6. Moreover, Ando also does not provide the missing disclosure by Tatchell Hannel and Numminen of the features recited in claim 6, nor was Matsubara relied on by the Examiner as providing such disclosure. Therefore, no obvious combination of Tatchell, Hannel, Numminen, and Matsubara would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the inventions recited in claim 10.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 1-15, and 17-19 are allowable over the prior art of record. It is thus also submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Toshihiko MUNETSUGU et al.

/Jeffrey R. Filipek/

By: 2008.09.02 16:13:29 -04'00'

Jeffrey R. Filipek
Registration No. 41,471
Attorney for Applicants

JRF/fs
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 2, 2008